



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,113	11.19.2001	Iris Pecker	01-22781	8049

7590 04/17/2003

G.E. EHRLICH (1995) LTD.  
c/o ANTHONY CASTORINA  
SUITE 207  
2001 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY  
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

HUTSON, RICHARD G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1652

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2003

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/988,113

Applicant(s)

PECKER ET AL.

Examiner

Richard G Hutson

Art Unit

1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f) to an application filed in a foreign country.

## Attachments

- 1) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-456)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-024)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Other

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-30 are at issue and are present for examination.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-30, drawn to a polynucleotide fragment encoding a polypeptide having at least 70% homology to SEQ ID NO: 10 (human placenta), in Paper No. 10 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

### ***Priority***

Applicants statement on the first line of the specification to state that this application is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/776,874, filed February 6, 2001, which is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/258,892, filed March 1, 1999, which is a continuation-in-part of PCT/US98/17954, filed August 31, 1998, which claims priority from U.S. Patent Application 09/109,386, filed July 2, 1998, now abandoned, which is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent Application No. 08/922,170, filed September 2, 1997, now U.S. Patent No. 5,968,822, is acknowledged.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure

Art Unit: 1652

information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper."

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Figures 16, 17 and 19 contain nucleotide and amino acid sequences that are not identified by a sequence identifier either in the figure itself or in the brief description of the figure. See M.P.E.P. Section

**2422.02** The Requirement for Exclusive Conformance; Sequences Presented in Drawing Figures

37 CFR 1.821(b) requires exclusive conformance, with regard to the manner in which the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences are presented and described, with the sequence rules for all applications that include nucleotide and amino acid sequences that fall within the definitions. ... It should be noted, though, that when a sequence is presented in a drawing, regardless of the format or the manner of presentation of that sequence in the drawing, the sequence must still be included in the Sequence Listing and the sequence identifier ("SEQ ID NO:X") must be used, either in the drawing or in the Brief Description of the Drawings.

Reference numbers 12, 33 and 34, listed at the end of the specification appear to have some additional non-Arabic characters that are confusing.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1-30 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Art Unit: 1652

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 20, 25, 26, 28 and 29 (claims 2-5, 8, 12-15, 18, 19, 21-24, 27 and 30 dependent from) each contain nonelected subject matter (i.e. SEQ ID NOs: 13, 14, 42, 43 and 44).

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 11, 13, 18, 19, 20, 22, 27, 28, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a polynucleotide fragment comprising a polynucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide having heparanase catalytic activity, wherein said polypeptide comprises the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 10, does not reasonably provide enablement for any polynucleotide fragment comprising a polynucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide ~~having heparanase catalytic activity, wherein said polypeptide shares 70% homology~~ with SEQ ID NO: 10. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is

Art Unit: 1652

1988)) as follows: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claim(s).

Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 11, 13, 18, 19, 20, 22, 27, 28, 29 and 30 are so broad as to encompass any polynucleotide fragment comprising a polynucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide having heparanase catalytic activity, wherein said polypeptide shares 70% homology with SEQ ID NO: 10. The scope of the claims is not commensurate with the enablement provided by the disclosure with regard to the extremely large number of polynucleotides broadly encompassed by the claims, including all polynucleotide fragments comprising a polynucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide having heparanase catalytic activity, wherein said polypeptide shares 70% homology with SEQ ID NO: 10. Since the amino acid sequence of a protein determines its structural and functional properties, predictability of which changes can be tolerated in a protein's amino acid sequence and obtain the desired activity requires a knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acids in the protein's

sequence, if any, are tolerant of modification and which are conserved (i.e. expectedly intolerant to modification), and detailed knowledge of the ways in which the proteins' structure relates to its function. However, in this case the disclosure is limited to that polynucleotide fragment comprising a polynucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide

Art Unit: 1652

having heparanase catalytic activity, wherein said polypeptide comprises the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 10.

While recombinant and mutagenesis techniques are known, it is not routine in the art to screen for multiple substitutions or multiple modifications, as encompassed by the instant claims, and the positions within a protein's sequence where amino acid modifications can be made with a reasonable expectation of success in obtaining the desired activity/utility are limited in any protein and the result of such modifications is unpredictable. In addition, one skilled in the art would expect any tolerance to modification for a given protein to diminish with each further and additional modification, e.g. multiple substitutions.

The specification does not support the broad scope of the claims which encompass all modifications and fragments of any polynucleotide fragment comprising a polynucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide having heparanase catalytic activity, wherein said polypeptide shares 70% homology with SEQ ID NO: 10, because the specification does not establish: (A) regions of the encoded protein's structure which may be modified without effecting heparanase activity; (B) the general tolerance of heparanases to modification and extent of such tolerance; (C) a rational and predictable

scheme for modifying any amino acid residue of a heparanase protein with an expectation of obtaining the desired biological function; and (D) the specification provides insufficient guidance as to which of the essentially infinite possible choices is likely to be successful. Because of this lack of guidance, the extended experimentation

Art Unit: 1652

the heparanase activity claimed and the fact that the relationship between the sequence of a polypeptide and its tertiary structure (i.e. its activity) are not well understood and are not predictable (e.g., see Ngo et al. in *The Protein Folding Problem and Tertiary Structure Prediction*, 1994, Merz et al. (ed.), Birkhauser, Boston, MA, pp. 433 and 492-495, Ref: U, Form-892), it would require undue experimentation for one skilled in the art to arrive at the majority of those polynucleotides of the claimed genus encoding polypeptides with the claimed heparanase activity.

Thus, applicants have not provided sufficient guidance to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention in a manner reasonably correlated with the scope of the claims broadly including any polynucleotide fragment comprising a polynucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide having heparanase catalytic activity, wherein said polypeptide shares 70% homology with SEQ ID NO: 10. The scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation with the scope of enablement (*In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 19 24 (CCPA 1970)). Without sufficient guidance, determination of having the desired biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue. See *In re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11



Art Unit: 1652

1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-30 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent No. 5,968,822. An obvious type double patenting rejection is appropriate where conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent No. drawn to a polynucleotide fragment comprising a polynucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide having heparanase catalytic activity, wherein said polypeptide shares 70% homology with SEQ

ID NO: 10 anticipates claims 1-30 of the instant application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard G Hutson whose telephone number is (703)

Art Unit: 1652

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy can be reached on (703) 308-3804. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3014 for regular communications and (703) 305-3014 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



Richard Hutson, Ph.D.  
Primary Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1652  
April 15, 2003



BRUCE KISLIUK, DIRECTOR  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600